

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 29-70 were rejected. Claims 1-28 and 71-94 were allowed. By the present Response, claims 29, 52, and 65 are amended. Upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-94 will remain pending in the present patent application. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the present action, the Examiner rejected claims 29-51 and claims 52-70 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. With regard to claims 29-51, the Examiner indicated a lack of antecedent basis for two terms (“the dominant” and “the homogenization”) found in claim 29. Therefore, the Applicants have amended claim 29 to provide the antecedent basis requested by the Examiner. These amendments are not believed to narrow the scope of claim 29 in any manner but, instead, merely correct a purported lack of antecedent basis.

With regard to claims 52-70, the Examiner indicated a lack of antecedent basis for the term “the non-selected regions” found in claim 52. Therefore, the Applicants have amended independent claim 52 and dependent claim 65 to recite “one or more non-selected regions,” thereby providing the antecedent basis requested by the Examiner. These amendments are not believed to narrow the scope of claims 52 or 65 in any manner but, instead, merely correct a purported lack of antecedent basis.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claim 52 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite with regard to the phrase “different manners.” While Applicants do not agree that the original recitation of claim 52 to “processing the selected regions and the non-selected regions in different manners” is indefinite, Applicants have amended claim 52 to clarify that what is intended to be conveyed is that the selected regions and non-selected regions are differentially processed relative to one another to create a processed image. Support and an exemplary embodiment for this recitation can

be found in the application at page 11, line 12 to page 12, line 6. This amendment is not believed to narrow the scope of claim 52 in any manner but, instead, merely clarifies that the selected and non-selected regions are processed differently relative to one another.

If the Examiner wishes to maintain this rejection, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner suggest suitable language that conveys the concept of differentially processing the selected and non-selected regions that the Examiner finds acceptable.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 28, 2005



John M. Rariden
Reg. No. 54,388
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545